TEN OF THE WORLD'S BEST STUDIES, THROUGH THE EYES OF A COMPOSER (and a Computer!) by Velimir Kalandadze (Tbilisi) and John Roycroft (London) (Russian translated with assistance from Efim Maidanik)

## INTRODUCTION

EG has scant space for reprinting the classics, but the commented selection by the Georgian composer came at an opportune moment, for the Sargon 2.5 chessplaying machine was on hand. The old could be combined with the new. How would Sargon fare in solving these ten, selected as they were without reference to Sargon? It would be an objective test of the machine's capabilities, albeit tough on the machine, since it was not intended for study-solving but for chessplaying. In the outcome Sargon solved well, finding 46 white moves out of 92 at ', Level 2 ', and 61 at '"Level 3 '. At the higher, and slower, levels (namely, 4, 5 and 6 ) its performance did not significantly improve, as illustrated by the example of K2, Sargon's one disaster. The reader who wishes to compare the main line solution with Sargon's choice can look at the ''SL2" and 'SL3" moves (for Sargon Level 2 and Level 3), where either the move chosen by the machine is given, or else just the move number (when Sargon chose the main line move). In every case, after Sargon had chosen its white move, I fed in the black response (if necessary after correcting Sargon's selection). As a computer and studies specialist I am bound to express the opinion that Sargon was impressive.

New versions of the machine can only improve its performance - and new versions are promised.
(AJR)
The art of chess composition did not attain its present level all at once - the development path has been long. Many of the most interesting study ideas have needed decades to acquire that final polish. Ideas that were first shown in classic studies found new life in later works, even forming the basis for masterpieces. At times the opposite transpired: some were so perfect that composers of following generations could not enrich them substantially. Today such works still attract us with their unfading brilliance. K1 by the (Czech) Grandmaster Richard Réti was a sensation when it appeared, and for us it has retained its paradoxical centre. We are astonished, then delighted, by the depth and originality of the main theme.


K1: 1. Kg7 h4 2. Kf6 Kb6 3. Ke5 h3 4. Kd6 h2 5. c7.
Sargon's W Moves. SL2: 1, 2, Kg5, c7, 5.

SL3: 1, 2, Kg5, 4, 5.

The idea of K1 was used in many works, but all were weaker than the original. It was only in 1928 that the Sarychev brothers published a study that can be considered a creative development of Reti's idea. In K2 the development is even more paradoxical and unexpected, an excellent example of creative enhancement of the heritage of the classics.


K2: 1. Kc8 b5 2. Kd7 b4 3. Kd6 Bf5 4. Ke5 B- 5 . Kd4.
Sargon's W Moves SL2: Kd8, Kd8, c8Q, Ke7, Kf6.
SL3: c8Q, Kd8, c8Q, Kd5, Kd5.
SL4: 1, Kd8, Ke8, Ke7, Kd5.
SL5: 1, Kb7, c8Q, Ke7, 5.
SL6: c8Q, Kb7, Kd8, Ke7, 5.
K3: by Saavedra has been published in chess magazines continually, ever since it first appeared. Its attraction is in its simplicity, its depth, its sharpness. Unfailingly, to play it through gives aesthetic pleasure. And how many later studies have there been under its spell? But from the standpoint of harmony of form and content $\mathbf{K 3}$ is the ideal.


K3: 1. c7 Rd6 $\dagger$ 2. $\mathrm{Kb} 5 \mathrm{Rd} 5 \dagger$ 3. Kb4 $\mathrm{Rd} 4 \dagger$ 4. $\mathrm{Kb} 3(\mathrm{c} 3) \mathrm{Rd} 3 \dagger(\mathrm{Rd} 1)$ 5. Kc 2 Rd4 6. c8R Ra4 7. Kb3.

## Sargon's W Moves

SL2: Kc7, 2, Kc6, 4, 5, c8Q, 7.
SL3: 1, 2, Kb6, 4, 5, Kc3, 7.
(The machine has currently no capability for automatically choosing an underpromotion.)

Emanuel Lasker's $\mathbf{K 4}$ is one of the immortals. Lasker created here a basis for interesting manoeuvres in the type of composition known as "'systematic movement of pieces". His study has great practical and theoretical value. And it is realised in miniature form.


K4: 1. $\mathrm{Kb} 8 \mathrm{Rb} 2 \dagger$ 2. Ka 8 Rc 2 3. Rh6 $\dagger$ Ka 5 4. $\mathrm{Kb} 7 \mathrm{Rb} 2 \dagger$ 5. Ka 7 Rc 2 6. $\mathrm{Rh} 5 \dagger$ Ka4 7. Kb6 Rb2 $\dagger$ 8. Ka6 Rc2 9. Rh4 $\dagger$ Ka3 10. Kb6 Rb2 $\dagger$ 11. Ka5 Rc2 12. Rh3 $\dagger$ K-13. Rxh2.

## Sargon's W Moves

SL2: Rh8, 2, 3, Rh8, Ka8, Rxh2, Ka6, Ka7, Ra5 $\dagger$, Rxh2, 11, Ra4 $\dagger, 13$.
SL3: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, Ra6 $\dagger, \mathrm{Kb} 8,8$, Ra5 $\dagger$, Rxh2, 11, 12, 13.

K5 by the British player Van Vliet expresses a significant chess idea and is also reprinted regularly. The wQ sacrifices itself several times, forcing bQ to squares on the diagonal and file where she becomes a victim of the newborn wQ on b8. All this is so elegant and unexpected that it leaves a long-lasting impression.


K5: 1. Qb4 Qd5 2. $\mathrm{Qa4} \dagger \mathrm{~Kb} 6$ 3. $\mathrm{Qb} 3 \dagger$ Qxb3 4. b8Q $\dagger$.
Or 1. ..., Qh1 2. Qa3 $\dagger$ Kb6 3. Qb2 $\dagger$ Kc7 4. Qh2 $\dagger$ Qxh2 5. b8Q $\dagger$.

## Sargon's W Moves

SL2: Qa2 $\dagger, \mathrm{Qe} 7, \mathrm{Qb} 4 \dagger, 4$.
SL3: 1, Qb2, 3, 4.
SL2: Qd6 $\dagger, \mathrm{Qa} 7 \dagger, 4,5$.
SL3: Qa4 $\dagger$, Qd6 $\dagger, 4,5$.

If $\mathbf{K 5}$ influenced many composers, nevertheless K 6 is quite incomparable. The idea of checkmate is popular enough, but particularly so that of checkmate with the knight. Many old and many modern studies have shown this in an interesting manner. But Korolkov's K6 (and Selman's slighther earlier version) is the finest of all time. Filigree double-edged play culminates in a spectacular, unexpected finale. The solution is unforgettable.


K6: 1. $\mathrm{f} 7 \mathrm{Ra} \mathrm{R}^{\dagger}$ 2. $\mathrm{Ba} 3 \mathrm{Rxa} 3 \dagger$ 3. Kb 2
$\mathrm{Ra} 2 \dagger$ 4. $\mathrm{Kcl} \mathrm{Ral} \dagger$ 5. $\mathrm{Kd} 2 \mathrm{Ra} 2 \dagger$ 6. Ke 3
Ra3 $\dagger$ 7. $\mathrm{Kf} 4 \mathrm{Ra} 4 \dagger$ 8. $\mathrm{Kg} 5 \mathrm{Rg} 4 \dagger$ 9. Kh6 Rg8 10. Se7 Be6 11. fgQ $\dagger$ Bxg8 12. Sg6 mate.
Sargon's W Moves
SL2: Se7, Kb2, 3, Kxa2, Kb2, Kc3, Kd4, 8, Kh5, 10, 11, 12.
SL3: Se7, 2, 3, Kxa2, Kb2, Kc1, 7, 8, Kh5, 10, 11, 12.

Also very popular is K7 by the French composer Villeneuve -Esclapon. After subtle and attractive play there arises a laconic and crystal-clear position in which bS and bR are powerless to win against wB . The idea is so paradoxical that to begin with one doubts the position's correctness, but the doubt soon disolves and we see that it is real chess masterpiece. That this idea has been repeated in subsequent works does not diminish its brilliance.


K7: 1. Kh5 Sf5 2. Bxb2 Rxh6 $\dagger$ 3. Kg5 Rh2 4. Be5 Rf2 5. Bf4 Sd4 6. Be3 Rf5 $\dagger$ 7. Kg4 Rd5 8. Kf4 Kb6 9. Ke4 Kc5 10. Kd3 Rd6 11. Bf2(g1).
Sargon's W Moves
SL2: $\mathrm{Kg} 5,2,3,4,5,6,7,8, \mathrm{Bg} 1$, Bf4, 11.

SL3: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, Bg1, Bf4, 11.

Mitrofanov's K8 won wide recognition on its publication. After natural and unconstrained play, W unexpectedly sacrifices $w Q$ and on the board appears a unique position where bQ and two pieces can do nothing to stop the passed cP winning. The innovation and extravagance make this study one of the wonders of chess art.


K8: 1. $\mathrm{b} 6 \dagger \mathrm{Ka8}$ 2. g 7 h 1 Q 3. $\mathrm{g} 8 \mathrm{Q} \dagger$ Bb8 4. a7 Sc6 5. dc Qxh5 $\dagger$ 6. Qg 5 Qxg5 $\dagger$ 7. Ka6 Bxa7 8. c7 Qa5† 9. Kxa5 Kb7 (Note: 9. ..., Bxb6 $\dagger$ 10. Kxb6 S-) 10.ba

## Sargon's W Moves

SL2: 1, b7 $\dagger, 3,4,5, \mathrm{Kb4}, 7,8,9,10$. SL3: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, Kb4, 7, 8, 9, 10.
Modern composers exhibit great interest in R-studies. This becomes understandable when one realises that the rook permits the 'personification' of various systematic and geometrical movements, with numerous traps. In 1972 the Georgian author of this article published a study, in which wRR are sacrificed to neutralise a strong B1 passed pawn.
Then the Czech Grandmaster, Dr. Jindrich Fritz, composed a study where the passed pawn is stopped via sacrifice of $w Q$. The author succeeded in combining these two ideas in $\mathbf{K 9}$, published in 1979.
K9: 1. Kh3 Rh4 $\dagger$ 2. Kxh4 Rb1 3. Ra2 $\dagger$ Kxa2 4. Rc2 $\dagger$ Rb2 5. Rc1 Rb1 6. Rh1 Rxh1 7. h8Q Rg1 8. Qa8 $\dagger$ Kb2 9. Qh1 Rxh1 10. b7 and really wins, easily.

## Sargon's W Moves

SL2: Kg3, 2, 3, Ra7 $\dagger$, Rxb2 $\dagger, \mathrm{h} 8 \mathrm{Q}, 7$,


8, Qd5, 10.
SL3: $\mathrm{Kg} 3,2, \mathrm{Rc} 2 \dagger, 4,5, \mathrm{Rc} 2 \dagger, 7,8$, Qb7, 10.

Finally, Somov-Nasimovich present us with the dazzling play of his K10. This is the epitome of the attractive, hardfought contest, the epitome of drama in chess composition.


K10: 1. e5 Qxe5 2. $\mathrm{f} 8 \mathrm{Q} \dagger \mathrm{Kg} 1$ 3. c3 Qel $\dagger$ 4. Bb 1 Qxc 3 5. $\mathrm{Rg} 7 \dagger \mathrm{Bxg} 76$. Qfl $\dagger$ Kxfl 7. Bd3 $\dagger$ Kel 8. bc Kd2 9. $\mathrm{Bc} 2 \mathrm{Kc} 1 \mathrm{1}^{2} . \mathrm{Bb} 3 \mathrm{Bxb} 3$ stalemate. Sargon's W Moves
SL2: $\mathrm{f} 8 \mathrm{Q} \dagger, 2,3,4, \mathrm{Qg} 8 \dagger, \mathrm{Qxg} 7 \dagger, 7,8$, Be4, 10.
SL3: $\mathrm{f} 8 \mathrm{Q} \dagger, 2,3,4$, $\mathrm{Qf} 1 \dagger, \mathrm{Qxg} 7 \dagger, 7,8$, 9, 10.
It may be that a first impression from these studies is that they have nothing to do with the normal chessplaying struggle, but in reality they tell us about the most fundamental chess laws, and they do so in the language of artistic chess composition.

## DIAGRAMS



No. 4164: A. Sarychev. 1. Sc3 + Sxc3 2. $\mathrm{h} 7 \mathrm{Bf} 7+3 . \mathrm{Kg} 5 \mathrm{Se} 4+4 . \mathrm{Kxf} 4 \mathrm{Sf} 8$ 5. h8Q Sg6 + 6. Kxe4 Sxh8 7. Bb6 $\mathrm{Bg} 6+8 . \mathrm{Kd} 5 \mathrm{Bf} 7+9 . \mathrm{Ke} 4 \mathrm{Bg} 6+10$. Kd5, draw, for if $10 . \ldots, \mathrm{Bf} 7+11$. Ke4 Sg6 12. Bd4, while 10. ..., g5 11. Kf5 wins gP, and 10. ..., g6 11. Bd4 wins bS. And 11. Bd4 is theatened anyway.
JRH: Cf. Gurvich (1953), No. 272 in Porreca.


No. 4165: E. Saba and N. Kralin. 1. $\mathrm{g} 8 \mathrm{~S}+/ \mathrm{i} \mathrm{Kg} 7 / \mathrm{ii}$ 2. Sxh6 Bxh6 3. $\mathrm{Rg} 8+\mathrm{Kh} 7$ 4. $\mathrm{Rg} 7+\mathrm{Kxg} 7$ 5. e8S + Kh 7 6. $\mathrm{Sf} 6+\mathrm{Kg} 77 . \mathrm{Se} 8+$.
i) 1. $\mathrm{Rf} 8+$ ? $\mathrm{Kxg} 72 . \mathrm{Rg} 8+\mathrm{Bxg} 83$. e8Q Bf7.
ii) 1. ..., Bxg8 2. Rf8 +Kxe 7 3. Rxg 8 Sf4+ 4. Kg4 Se6 5. Rg6.


No. 4166: F.S. Aitov and G.A. Umnov. 1. Kg1 Bf5 2. Sxf5 b2 3. Se3 b1Q 4. Sd1 d4 5. Bf3 Qg6 + 6. Kh1 Qc2 7. Sf2 + Qxf2 8. Bg4 + Kxg4 9. H3 + K- stalemate.


No. 4167: A. Belenky. 1. Sd6 + Sxd6 2. Ra8 + Kc7 3. Rxd8 Kxd8 4. Rh5 $\operatorname{Bd} 4+$ 5. Kxd6 $\operatorname{Bg} 2$ 6. Rg5 $\operatorname{Sxg} 5$ stalemate.


No. 4168: V. Razumenko. 1. f7 Bb4 2. Bxb4 b1S 3. f8Q alQ 4. Qf6+ Qxf6 + 5. gf Sg 3 6. $\mathrm{f} 7 \mathrm{Sf} 5+$ 7. Kf8 Bxf7 8. Bc5 Sd2 9. Bb6 e3 10. Bc7 Sc4 11. Bd8.


No. 4169: Y. Makletsov. 1. Re8+ Kf4 2. Kf2 g1Q + 3. Kxg1 Rxh3 4. Kg2 Rh5 5. Sg3 Rxg5 6. Re4 mate. JRH: The mate is known, e.g. Forth in Cheron I. 435, but this approach seems new.


No. 4170: M. Gogberashvili. 1. ..., $\mathrm{Bh} 2+$ 2. Ka8/i b2 3. a7 b1Q 4. $\mathrm{Rc} 7+\mathrm{Kf} 6$ 5. $\mathrm{Rf} 7+\mathrm{Ke} 5$ 6. $\operatorname{Re} 7+$ Kd4 7. Rd7 + Kc3 8. Rc7 + Kd2 9. $\mathrm{Rd} 7+\mathrm{Kel} 10 . \operatorname{Re} 7+\mathrm{Kf} 1$ 11. Rb7 Qf5 12. Rf7 Qxf7 stalemate.
i) Not given is 2 . $\mathrm{Rc} 7+$ ?, but it loses by 2. ..., Kd8 3. a7 b2 4. a8Q b1Q + 5. $\mathrm{Qb} 7 \mathrm{Bxc} 7+6 . \mathrm{Ka} 7 \mathrm{Qg} 1+$ 7. Ka8 $\mathrm{Qa} 1+$ 8. Qa7 Qh8 9. Qb7 (Qa4, $\mathrm{Ke} 7+$ wins, or $\mathrm{Kb} 7, \mathrm{Qh} 1+$;) 9. ...,
$\mathrm{Kd} 7+10 . \mathrm{Ka} 7 \mathrm{Qa} 1+11 . \mathrm{Qa} 6 \mathrm{Qd} 4+$ 12. Kb7 (Ka8, $\mathrm{Qh} 8+;$ ) 12. $\mathrm{Qb} 2(4)+$. (AJR) bK was originally on g7.
JRH: Sehwers, No. 74 in his collection, is of interest.


No. 4171: D. Gurgenidze. Judge: N. Kralin. Only 29 studies were published in the 52 issues. 1. Ke8 e5 2. b6 Kxg5 3. b6 Rb1 4. Rg2 $+\mathrm{Kh} 4 / \mathrm{i} 5$. Rxf2 Rxb7 6. Re2 Rb5 7. Kd7 Kg4 8. Kc6 Kf3 9. Re1 Ra5 10. Kb6/ii Kf2 11. Re4 Kf3 12. Re1 Rd5 13. Kc6 Ra5 14. Kb6 Kf2 15. Re4.
i) 4. ..., Kf4 5. Rxf2 + Re3 6. Rf7, this possibility explaining the first move.
ii) 10. Rf1+? Ke2 11. Rf5 Kd3 12. Kb6 Rd5 13. Kc6 Kd4 14. Rh5 Rd8.


No. 4172: L. Mitrofanov. 1. Sc7 a3 2. Se6 + Kh4/i 3. Kh2 a2 4. Sd4 Kg5 5. Sc2/ii Kh4 6. Kg2/iii alQ 7. Sxal g5 8. Kf3, and no more stalemates. i) 2. ..., Kf6 3. Sd4 Ke5 4. Sc2.
ii) 5. Sb3? Kf4 6. Kg2 g5 7. Kf2 Ke4 8. Ke2 Kf4 9. Kd3 10. Ke4 Kf2 11. Kf5 Ke2.
iii) A position of reciprocal zugzwang.

No. 4173
G. Slepyan (v.78)


No. 4173: G. Slepyan. 1. e4, with 2 lines: 1. ..., g6 2. e5 h6 3. c4 dc 4. e6 c3 5. e7 c2 6. e8S c1Q+ 7. Bc2 Qxc2 + 8. Kd8 S- 9. Sf6 mate.

1. ..., de 2. d5 g6 3. d6 h6 4. d7 e3 5. d8R/i e2 6. Rxd2 edQ 7. Rxd1 wins. i) $5 . \mathrm{d} 8 \mathrm{Q}$ ? e2 6. Bxe2 d1Q 7. B(Q)xd1 stalemate.


No. 4174: Y. Zwmlyansky and V. Kovalenko. 1. b4/i Rb5/ii 2. b7 Rxb7 3. Rd8 Ra7 + 4. Kb8 Rb7 + 5. Ka8 Sd4/iii 6. Rxd5/iv Sb5 7. Rxb5 Rh7 8. Rb7 9. b5 + Rxb5 stalemate.
i) 1. b7? Kb6 + 2. Kb8 Se5 3. Rc7 Rc5 4. Rh7 Sc6 +5 . Kc8 Sa5 +6. Kb8 Rb5 7. Kc8 Sxb7 8. Rxb7 + Kc5.
iii) 5. ..., d4 6. b5 + Rxb5 7. Rxd4 Sxd4 stalemate.
iv) 6. Rd6 + ? Sc6 7. Rxc6+ Rb6 8. Rc5 Rd6 9. Kb8 Kb6 10. Kc8 d4.
ii) 1. ..., Ra1 2. b7 Kb6 + 3. Kb8 Se5 4. Rc5 Sc6 + 5. Kc8 Rh1 6. Rxd5.


No. 4175: V. Israelov and A. Sarychev. 1. Sd6 + Kd5 2. Sf5 Sxf4 3. Sxg 3 Be 5 4. $\mathrm{Sd} 7 \mathrm{Sg} 6+5$. Kf7 Sh8 + 6. Kg8 Bxg3 7. Sf6/i Ke6 8. Sh5 Be5 9. d4 Bxd4 10. Sg7 + Kf6 11. Kxh8 Kg6 12. Kg8 Bxg7 stalemate, or 11. ..., Kf7 12. Kh7 Bxg7 stalemate. i) 7. Kxh8? Ke6 8. Sf8 + Kf7 9. Sh7 Be5 + .


No. 4176: K. Sumbatyan (Moscow). 1. Ba4 Sf3 2. Bxb5 Sd4 3. Be8 Kcl 4. Bg6 Bg8 5. Bf5 Bf7 6. Bh7 Be6 7. Bg6 Bg8 8. Bf5.


No. 4177: V.A. Bron. 1. e6 fe 2. f7 Rf6 3. de Kf5 4. f8Q Rxf8 5. e7 Re8 6. Rxe8 Ke6 7. Kb6 g5/i 8. Kc7 g4/ii 9. Kd8 Bc6 10. Rg8 Kf5 11. Kc7 Bb5 12. Rb8 Ba4 13. Ra8 Bb5 14. Ra5 wins.
i) 7. ..., Kf 7 8. Rg 8 Kxe 7 9. $\mathrm{Rxg} 7+$ and $10 . \mathrm{Rxg} 2$.
ii) 8. ..., Kf7 9. Kd8 Bc6 10. Rf8 + Ke6 11. e8Q + .


Nc. 4178: A. Belenky. 1. Be1 Se3 + 2. Kxg5 Sh3 + 3. Kh4 Sf4 4. Bb4 (Bg3? Bf6 mate) fSg2 + 5. Kh3 Bxh8 6. Bd6 + K-7. Be5 Bxe5 stalemate. JRH: The stalemate is at least as old as Berger (1890), No. 46 in Dedrle's Finales Artisticos.


No. 4179: V.N. Dolgov and Al.P. Kuznetsov. 1. d8Q f1Q 2. Qf6 + Ke2 3. Qxf1 + Kxf1 4. d7 a2 5. d8Q a1Q + 6. Qf6 + Qxf6 7. Kxf6 b3 8. c7 b2 9. c8Q blQ 10. Qf5 + Qxf5 + 11. Kxf5 Ke2 12. Ke4 Kd2 13. h5 c4 14. h6 c3 15. h7 c2 16. h8Q c1Q 17. $\mathrm{Qh} 2+\mathrm{Kc} 3$ 18. Qc7 +Kd 219. Qxcl + Kxc1 20. Kd3 Kb2 21. e4 a5 22. e5 a4 23. e6 a3 24. e7 a2 25. e8Q a1Q 26. Qb5 + Ka3 27. Qa6 +Kb 2 28. Qxb6 + Ka3 29. Qa5 + Kb2 30. Qb4+ Ka2 31. Kc2. '’Ten promotions!"
JRH: The final mating sequence is well known, but the successive promotions are unique and amusing.


No. 4180: A.P. Kazantsev. 1. c5 g5 2. d 4 g 4 3. d5 g3 4. d6 ed 5. cd g2 6. d7 g1Q 7. d8Q Qc5 + 8. Ke4 Qxc3 9. $\mathrm{Qg} 5+\mathrm{Kxg} 5$ stalemate.


No. 4181: N. K^rolapov. 1. Kc6/i Kd8 2. Ra8 +Ke 3. Ra1 b2 4. Rf1 c2 5. Bf2 c1Q 6. Bc5 + Qxc5 7. Kxc5. i) 1. Bxe5? b2 2. Bf6 Kd7.


No. 4182: G.A. Nadareishvili. 1. g6 + Kh8 2. Kh6 Bd5 3. f7 Bxf7 4. $\mathrm{g} 7+/ \mathrm{i} \mathrm{Kg} 85 . \mathrm{Bd} 3 \mathrm{Bg} 6$ 6. $\mathrm{Bc} 4+\mathrm{Bf} 7$ 7. Bd3 Sg5 8. Bh7 + Sxh7 stalemate. i) 4. gf? Ra8 5. Bb5 Sf4.

No. 4183: A. Ivanov (Chuvasj Autonomous Republic). The solution ('64' No. 5, 1979, p. 15) gives the composer's initial as 'V'. 'B'. 1. Rf7 Kb6 2. Rb7 + Ka6 3. Rb8 Sc7 4. Se6 Ka7 5. Sd4 a1Q 6. Sc6 + Ka6 7. $\mathrm{Sb} 4+\mathrm{Ka} 5$ 8. Sc6 +Ka 4 9. Rb4 + Ka3 10. Sd4 Sb3 + 11. Rxb3 + Ka2 12. Ra3 + Kxa3 13. Sc2 + . JRH: Cf. A. Ivanov (1974/5) EG43. 2502.

No. 4183
A. Ivanov (vii.78)

Special H.M., 64, 1978


No. 4184 D. Gurgenidze (x.78) Special H.M., 64, 1978


No. 4184: D. Gurgenidze. 1. Kd7 eRg6 2. Sc6 + bc 3. Rb2 + Ka8 4. Kc 7 and either 4. ..., Rg8 5. Sb5 +ab 6. Ra 2 mate, or 4. ..., a5 5. Sb6+ Ka7 6. Sc8 + Ka6 7. Rb6 mate. Composed following the sudden mate-in-three finale of the 17th World Championship Match game in Baguio.

No. 4185: J. Rusinek. Judge: Pauli Perkonoja. 1. a7 Ra5 2. e6 Bxe6 (Bb5;Rc5) 3. Re4 Bcl+/i 4. Kg3 $\mathrm{Ra} 3+5 . \mathrm{Kf} 2 \mathrm{Ra} 2+$ /ii $6 . \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Rg} 2+$ 7. Kf3 Bb5 8. a8Q Bxa8 stalemate. i) 3 . ..., $\mathrm{Rf} 5+4 . \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Rg} 5+5 . \mathrm{Kf} 2$ (h4). 3. ..., Bd5 4. Rel + and 5. $\mathrm{Re} 2+$.
ii) 5. ..., Rf3 + 6. Ke2 Bd5 7. Rd4 Re3 + 8. Kf2 Rf3 + 9. Ke2.


No. 4186: V.A. Bron. 1. b7 Bxb7 2. Bxb4 g1Q 3. Rc3 + Kd4 4. Bc5 + Kxc3 5. Bxg1 Se5 6. Bd4 +/i Kxd4 7. g7 Bc6+8. Kb4 Bxe4 9. g8Q Sc6+ 10. Kb3 (Ka4? Bc2+;) 10. ..., Bd5 + 11. Ka4 Bxg8 stalemate.
i) 6. g7? $\mathrm{Bc} 6+$ 7. Ka 5 Bb 5 8. g8Q Sa6 mate, or 8. Bxa7 Sc4 mate.


No. 4187: Em. Dobrescu. 1. Kb2/i Be2 2. h6 Kh7 3. Sg8 a1Q+ (Bd3; Bxa2) 4. Kxa1 Bd3 5. Bf7 Bg6 6. Ba2

Bd3/ii 7. Kb2 Kg6 8. Kc3 Be4 9. Kd4 Bc2 10. Ke5 Kg5 11. Ke6 Bh7 12. Kf7 $\mathrm{Bxg} 8+13 . \mathrm{Kg} 7$ wins.
i) 1. Kxa2? Be 2 2. h6 Kh7 3. Sg8 Bd3 4. Kb2 Kg6 5. Kc3 Bb1 6. Kd4 Kg5 7. Be4 8. Kxe4 Kg6 9. Ke5 Kh7.
ii) 6. ..., Bf5 7. $\mathrm{Kb} 2 \mathrm{Kg} 68 . \mathrm{Se} 7+$.


No. 4188: G.M. Kasparyan. 1. Sd5/i Kd7/ii 2. Se5 + Ke8 3. Sxf7/iii Kxf7 4. $\mathrm{g} 6+\mathrm{Kg} 7$ 5. e8S $+\mathrm{Kxg} 6 / \mathrm{iv} 6$. Sf4 + Kf5 7. Sd6 + Kf6 8. Se8 $+/ \mathrm{v}$ Kf7 9. Sd6 +Kg 7 10. Se8 +Kh 611. Kg 7 12. Se8 + , drawn, or if 11. ..., Sg5 12. Sf5 + Kh7 13. Kxg5.
i) 1. $\mathrm{e} 8 \mathrm{~S}+? \mathrm{Kd} 82 . \mathrm{Kg} 4 \mathrm{gSxf} 6+3$. Sxf6 Sxf6+4. gf Kd7.
ii) 1. ..., Kb7 2. Sd6 + and 3. Sxf7. iii) 3. g6? Sf8 + and 4. ..., Sxg6, but not, for Bl, 3. ..., hSf6? 4. Kg3 Sxd5 5. gf7 + Kxe7 6. Sg6 + .
iv) Leading to a position where wSS draw against bRSS.
v) $8 . \mathrm{Se} 4 ? \mathrm{Kg} 7$ 9. $\mathrm{Sh} 5+\mathrm{Kf} 8$.


No. 4189: A. Pituk. 1. Sb5 Se4/i 2. $\mathrm{c} 8 \mathrm{Q}+\mathrm{Bxc} 8$ 3. $\mathrm{Sc} 7+\mathrm{Kd} 8$ 4. ef/ii Sc5 + 5. Kxb4/iii Sd7 mate.
i) 1. ..., fe 2. Sd6 + Kd7 3. Sxb7 and 4. f7.
ii) 4. e7? Kxc7 5. e8Q Bd7 + .
iii) 5. Kb5? $\mathrm{Ba} 6+6 . \mathrm{Kxb} 4 \mathrm{Sd} 77$. Se6 +Kc 8 8. f8Q + Sxf8 9. Sxf8 Kd8.


No. 4190: E.I. Dvizov. 1. f6 Bf8 2. b6 c3 3. b7 c2 4. b8Q c1Q 5. Qxf8+ Kg 5 6. Qh6 + Kxh6 7. f8Q + Kg5 8. Qh6 + Kxh6 9. Sf7 mate.


No. 4191: V. Nestorescu. 1. Rg5 +/i Kf7 2. Sxd4 Qc7 + 3. Ke4 Bb7 +4 . Kd3 Bxa8 5. Rf5 + Kg6 6. Rg5 + Kh7 7. Rh5 +Kg 8 8. Rh8 $+\mathrm{Kf7} 9$. Rxa8 $\mathrm{Qg} 3+10 . \mathrm{Kc} 4 \mathrm{Qc} 7+11$. Kd5.
i) A cook is 1. Qc6 + Qc6 2. Rh6 + Kxg7 3. Rxc6 Rd8 4. a6 or 4. Sg 5. This was published with the solution in ii.79. No correction was supplied. The only reasonable explanation for the survival of the study in the award (provisional award, admittedly) is that the judge (who is a regular solver in Szachy) did not look at the solution as published (being such a strong solver himself!) and the column editor did not draw his attention to it. If the cook is defaeted, there is no mention in the pages of Szachy. The editorship of the studies in the Polish magazine has passes from the hands of Dr. Grzeban (Grzegory Bagdasarian) to those of Jan Rusinek. Dr Grzeban ran the column for over 20 years. (AJR).


No. 4192: J. Dankiewicz. 1. Rf8 + Kg 7 2. Qxf5 $+\mathrm{Kxf} 8 / \mathrm{i} 3 . \mathrm{g} 7+\mathrm{Kg} 8 / \mathrm{ii}$ 4. $\mathrm{Se} 7+\mathrm{Kxg} 75 . \mathrm{Sc} 6 / \mathrm{iii}$ Rxa7+/iv 6. Kxa7 Bxc6 7. Kb8 draw.
i) 2. ..., Kxg6 3. Sd6 cd 4. Rf6 + .
ii) 3. ..., Kf7 4. Sd6 + cd 5. g8Q + Kxg 8 stalemate.
iii) 5. Sd5? c6 6. Kxb7 cd 7. Kb6 d4 Kc5 d3 Kd4 d2 10. Kxe4 clQ 11. a8Q Qh1 + wins.
iv) 5. ..., Bxc6 stalemate. Or. 5. ..., R-, a pin stalemate.


Nc. 4193: D. Gurgenidze and E.L. Pogosyants. 1. $\mathrm{Sa} 4+\mathrm{Kb} 3 / \mathrm{i} 2$ 2. Bf7 + Kxa4 3. Bxa2 Ka5 4. Bb3/ii Rxb1+ 5. Kc2 Rb2 + 6. Kc3 Rb1 7. Kc2/iii $\mathrm{Rb} 2+8$. Kc3, with a positional draw.
i) 1. ..., Kxb1 2. Bg6 leaves B stalemated.
ii) 4. Kc2? $\mathrm{Sb} 4+5 . \mathrm{Kb} 2 \mathrm{Rxa} 2+$. iii) 7. Bc2? Rc1 8. Kxd3 Kb4.

No. 4194
E. Janosi (i.78)


No. 4194: E. Janosi. 1. Rg8 Sh3 + 2. Kf3 Rg5 3. g4 Ke7 (e6) 4. Kg3 Sg1 5. Kf4 Sh3 + 6. Kg3 Kf7 7. Ra8 (b8) Sg1 8. $\mathrm{Ra} 7+\mathrm{Ke} 8$ 9. Ra8 +Ke 710. $\mathrm{Ra} 7+\mathrm{Ke6} 11 . \mathrm{Ra} 6+\mathrm{Kf} 7$ 12. Ra7+ Kf8 13. Ra8 + Kg7 14. Re8 Ra5 15. Kg2 Ra1 16. g5, positional draw.

No. 4195: G.M. Kasparyan. 1. Rh7 Ra5 2. b7 Ka7/i 3. b8Q + Kxb8 4. Rh5 (Kb6? Rb5 + ;) 4. ...., Bb7 + /ii 5. Kb6 Ra6 + 6. Kxc5 Ra5 + 7. Kb6 Rxh5 stalemate.

i) 2. ..., Bxb7 + 3. Kb6. 2. ..., Sxb7 3. Kb6.
ii) 4. ..., Bb5 + 5. Kb6. 4. ..., Sb7 5. Rxa5 Sxa5 6. Kb6.


No. 4196: V. Kirillov and B.G Olympiev. 1. Bc4 Bc2 2. Bxb3 Bd3 3. Bc4 Bc2 4. Re2 Bb1 5. Rb2 Sd6 (Sc3; Rb3) 6. Rxb1 Sxc4 7. Rb4.


No. 4197: V.S. Kovalenko. 1. Sd4+/i
Ka5 2. Sb3 + Kb5 3. c8Q Sc7 + 4. Kb8 Sa6+ (Sc6+;Kb7) 5. Qxa6 + Kxa6 6. Bc4 mate.
i) 1. c8Q? Sc7 + 2. $\mathrm{Kb} 8 \mathrm{Sa6}+$. 1 . Sd6 + ? Ka5 2. Sc4 + Kb5 3. Sa3 + Kc5 4. c8Q Sc7 + 5. Kb8 Sc6 + 6. Kb7 Sa5 + 7. Kb8 Sc6 + .


No. 4198: A. Maksimovskikh and Y. Makletsov. 1. Sf6 $+\mathrm{Kf7}$ 2. $\mathrm{g} 8 \mathrm{Q}+$ Kxf6 3. Bxe5 +, and 2 varations: 3. ..., Qxe5 4. Qh8 + Kd6 6. Qb8 + Kd5 7. Qb5 + Kd4 8. Qb2 + Ke4 9. Qe2 + Kf4 10. Qh2 + Kf5 11. Qh5 + Kf6 12. Qh8 + Kf5 13. Qh5 + Ke4 14. Qe2 + Kd5 15. Qb5 + Ke6 16. Qe8 + Kf6 17. Qh8 + .
3. ..., Kxe5 4. Qg7 + Kd5 5. Qd7 + $\mathrm{Kc5}$ 6. Qa7 +Kc 4 7. Qa4 +Kd 3 (Kc3? Qb3 mate) 8. Qd1 + Ke3 9. $\mathrm{Qg} 1+\mathrm{Ke} 4$ 10. $\mathrm{Qg} 4+\mathrm{Ke} 511 . \mathrm{Qg} 7+$ Ke4 12. Qg4+ Kd3 13. Qd1 + Ke4 14. Qa4+ Kd5 15. Qd7 +Ke 516. Qg7+.

No. $4199 \quad$ G. Zakhodjakin (x.78)


No. 4199: G.N. Zakhodyakin. 1. d6 Sb4 2. e5/i h3 3. d7 Sc6 4. e6 h2 5. d8Q h1Q + 6. Kg8 Sxd8 7. e7.
i) 2. d7 Sc6 3. e5 Sd8.


No. 4200: Miroslav Sindelar. Judge of this annual informal competition of the composing supplement tot he monthly Ceskoslovensky Sach was Bohuslav Sivak of Banska Bystrica. 1. Bc 3 Qg 2 (for ..., $\mathrm{Qg} 8+$; and stalemate) 2. Bf 7 (for Bf 6 and $\mathrm{Bg} 5+$ ) 2 . ..., Qg4 3. Be5 Qg3 4. Bg6 Qc3 5. Be8 Qg3 6. Bf7 Qg4 7. Bg6 and wins, as bQ can no longer play to c3.

No. 4201: Vladislav Bunka. 1. f6 (Kb6? Bd4+;) 1. ..., e4 2. f7 Bg7 3. $\mathrm{f} 8 \mathrm{Q}+\mathrm{Bxf8} 4 . \mathrm{Kb6}$ Bc5 + 5. Kxc5 Ka 7 and now the originally published (ix.78) solution runs (it works, but it's very uninteresting) $6 . \mathrm{Kb5} \mathrm{f} 37$. Bxe4 g4 8. Ka5 (why not a wB move?), while the solution given with the award runs 6. Kd4 e3 7. Kd3 g4 8. Ke2 g3 9. Kf3 wins, which also works. Therefore a plain cook. Why the Second Prize? Indeed, why publish it at all?
JRH: Cf. Troitzky (1925), No. 91 in the Korolkov and Chekhover collection (1959).


No. 4202: L. Kopac. 1. Rbl/i Rxb1/ii 2. Bb3 Ral 3. Qc4 c1Q 4. Qf7 mate.
i) 1. Qc4? b1Q + 2. Rxb1 Rxb1 + 3 . Kc8 (Ka8,Sc6;Bxc6,Rb8 + ;Kxa7, gRb1;) 3. ..., Sa6 4. Bg8 Rb8+ 5. Kxd7 Sc5 + 6. Kc7 (Kc6,Rc8+;) 6. ..., Rb7 + and 7. ..., gRb1.
ii) 1. ..., Rf2 2. Qc4 Sc6 3. Bxc6 Rxb1 4. Ba4 Ra1 5. Bb3. 1. ..., Rxf3 2. Qxf3 Rd1 3. Qh5 Rxd5 4. Qh6 + Kf7 5. Qg6 + Kf8 6. Qxf6+ Kg8 7. Qg6 + K- 8. f6 wins. 1. ..., Rd1 2. Qc4 Sc6 3. Bxc6 Rxd6 4. Ba4 Rxb1 5. Bb3 Re6 6. fe. wPc2 was added later to defeat 1. ..., Rc1 2. Qc4 Rxc3 3. Qxc3 Rc1.


No. 4203: Vazha Neidze. 1. Ke2 $\mathrm{Sg} 3+$ 2. $\mathrm{Kxf} 2 \mathrm{Se} 4+$ 3. Kg 2 Sxg 5 (Kxg5;h6) 4. Bxc5 and now either: 4. $\ldots$, gh $5 . \mathrm{Bf} 2+\mathrm{g} 3$ 6. Bxg3 +Kg 47. Sh6 mate, or 4. ..., Kxh5 5. Sf6 + and 2 wB mates to follow.
JRH: The mate at g 4 is known -Liburkin (1933), No. 68 in Bouwmeester's book.


No. 4204: V.V. Novikov. 1. Sc6+ Kxa4 2. Sxa7 + Ka5/i 2. Bc8 Sc5 +/ii 4. Kc3/iii Sxa6 5. Sc6+ Kb5 6. Sd4 + Ka5 7. Sxb3 + Kb5 8. Bd7 mate.
i) 2. ..., Ka3 3. $\mathrm{Sb} 5+\mathrm{Kb} 4$ 4. a7 b2 Kc2.
ii) 3. ..., b2 4. Kc2 Sc5 5. Sc6 + and 6. a7.
iii) 4. Kc4? Sxa6 5. Sc6 + Ka4 6. Bxa6 b2.
JRH: The mate is known -- Gurvich (1972/9), No. 719 and Kasparyan (1936), No. 396, both in 2500.


No. 4205: M. Bordenyuk and Al.P. Kuznetsov. 1. Rxd5 c4 2. e6 + Kxe6 3. Rc5 cd 4. Rxc3 d2 5. Re3 + and 2 lines: 5. ..., Kf7 6. Rd3 Bc2 7. Kh8 Bxd3 stalemate, or 5. ..., Kf6 6. Rd3 Bc2 7. Kxh6 Bxd3 stalemate.


No. 4207: A. Koranyi. Judge: Grandmaster Istvan Bilek. 1. Kf4/i Ke6 2. Be1 Sf3 3. Bf2 h3 4. Kg3 h2 (Sg5; Be3) 5. Kg2 Kf5 6. Bg3 h1Q +7. Kxh1 Kg4/ii 8. $\mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Sd} 2+\mathrm{9}$. d5/iii Bxd5 $+10 . \mathrm{Kg} 1 \mathrm{Kxg} 3$ stalemate.
i) 1. Kf 2 ? $\mathrm{Sg} 4+2 . \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Kc} 4+3 . \mathrm{Kh} 3$ Sf2 + wins.
ii) With a mating plan involving bB playing to $\mathrm{b} 7-\mathrm{a} 6-\mathrm{f} 1-\mathrm{g} 2$.
iii) 9. Kf2? Se4 + . 9. Kh2? Sf1 + .


No. 4208: Al.P. Kuznetsov. 1. Se2/i Bxc2 2. Sf3 Bxf3 3. Rb1 Be2 4. Rg1 Bxd3 + 5. Ke5 Bxc4 6. b6 Bf1 7. Kd6 Kb 8 8. $\mathrm{Kd} 7 \mathrm{Bb} 5+9 . \mathrm{Ke} 7 \mathrm{Bf} 1$ (Bc6? Rd1;) 10. Kd8 g6 11. Kd7 Bb5 + 12. Ke7 Bf1 13. Kd8 g5 ... 19. ..., g3 20-22. Kd7-f7-d8 wins.
i) 1. Sf3? Bxf3 2. Se2 Bxe2 3. Rb1 Bxd3+.


No. 4209: E. Janosi. 1. Rf6 + Kxf6 2. Sd3/i d1S/ii 3. e8S + /iii Ke7 4. $\mathrm{Sg} 7 \mathrm{Kf} 75 . \mathrm{Kd} 5 / \mathrm{iv} \mathrm{Sc3}+6$. Kc6 Sa2 7. Kb5 Sb8 8. Kc4 draw.
i) 2. e 8 Q ? $\mathrm{Sf} 5+3 . \mathrm{Kd} 3 \mathrm{~d} 1 \mathrm{Q}+4 . \mathrm{Kc} 3$ Qxc1+, or 3. Ke4 Sd6+ 4. Kd3 d1Q+.
ii) 2. ..., Kxe7 3. Sb2, or 2. ..., Sf5 + 3. Kc3.
iii) 3. e8Q? Sf5 + 4. Ke4 Sd6+, winning with bSSS.
iv) 5. Sc5? Sxc5 6. Kxc5 Kxg7, and the ''Troitzky line"' favours Black.


No. 4210: V.N. Dolgov. 1. Rc4 + Kb5/i 2. Rc5 + Kb6 3. Rb5 + Ka6 4. $\mathrm{Rb} 6+\mathrm{Ka} 7$ 5. $\mathrm{Ra} 6+\mathrm{Kb} 7$ 6. $\mathrm{Ra} 7+$ Kc6 7. Rc7 + Kd5 8. Rc5 + Ke4 9. Re5 + Kd4 10. Bf $2+$ wins.
i) 1. ..., Kd5 2. $\mathrm{Rc} 5+\mathrm{Ke} 4$ 3. $\mathrm{Re} 5+$ Kd4 4. Bf2 + .
JRH: Cf. Fritz (1951), No. 239 in his collection, and Vandecasteele (1971)
in Schakend Nederland: wKb3, wRf3, wBa6,b8; bKg2,bRa6,bPb4,g5. 1. $\mathrm{Rg} 3+\mathrm{Kh} 2$ 2. Rg2 + Kh1 3. Rh2 + Kg 1 4. Rh1 +Kf 2 5. Rf1 +Ke 36. $\mathrm{Rf} 3+\mathrm{Kd} 2$ 7. $\mathrm{Rd} 3+\mathrm{Kcl}$ 8. Bb 5 Rxb5 9. $\mathrm{Bb} 2+$ and $10 . \mathrm{Rd} 1$ mate.


No. 4211: G.M. Kasparyan. 1. d7 Bf6 2. Rxa1 Ke6 + 3. Kc4 Bd8 4. Sg4 (Ra7? Kd6;) 4. ..., Bf5 5. De3/i Be4 6. Rd1 Bc6 7. Sd5 Bxd7 8. $\mathrm{Sf} 4+\mathrm{Ke} 7$ 9. $\mathrm{Sg} 6+\mathrm{Ke} 8$ 10. Rel $+\mathrm{Kf7} 11$. $\mathrm{Se} 5+\mathrm{Ke} 6(\mathrm{e} 7$, e8) $12 . \mathrm{Sc} 6+$ wins. i) 5. Sh6? Bh3 6. Ra7 Ke 7 draw.


No. 4212: Y. Makletsov. 1. hSf5 Rh6 + (against $\mathrm{Sd} 4+$ ) 2. Sh4+ (Sxh6? Bxg3;) 2. ..., Rxh4 + /i 3. Bxh4 Bxd7 + 4. Kh2 Kf2 5. Kh1 $\mathrm{Bc} 6+$ 6. $\mathrm{Se} 4+(\mathrm{Kh} 2$ ? $\mathrm{Bg} 2 ;$ ) 6. ..., Kf1 7. Bg3 Bxg3 stalemate.
i) 2. ..., Kf 2 3. $\mathrm{Se} 4+\mathrm{Kg} 1$ 4. Bxc7 Bxd7 + 5. Kg3.
JRH: Cf. Kaiev (1932), No. 1719 in 2500.


No. 4213: M. Matous. 1. $\mathrm{Sc} 1+\mathrm{Kd} 2$ 2. $\mathrm{Sb} 3+\mathrm{Kd1}$ 3. Rd8 + Bxd8 4. f8Q Qxf8 5. b8Q Bf6+ 6. Kb1 Qe7 7. Qb7 Qxb7 stalemate.


No. 4214: V.A. Bron. 1. Ra8 + Kxa8 2. $\mathrm{g} 8 \mathrm{Q}+\mathrm{Ka7} 3 . \mathrm{Qb} 8+\mathrm{Kxb} 84$. $\mathrm{de}+$ Ka7 5. Bb8 + Ka8/i 6. Bd5 + Rxd5 + 7. Kxe2 and now, 7. ..., Rf5 8. Kf1 Rf8 9. efS wins, or 7. ..., Rd1 8. Kxf2 Rd8 9. edS.
i) 5. ..., Кха6 6. Вс4 + Кха5 7. Вхе2.


No. 4215: E. Asaba. 1. d7 + Qxe7 2. b4 + Kxb6 3. Sxd5 + Kb5 4. Sxe7 $\mathrm{Rd} 2+5$. Kxcl Rxd7 6. $\mathrm{Rg} 5+\mathrm{Kxb} 4$ 7. Sd5 + Kb3 8. Rg3 + Ka2 9. Sba + Ka1 10. Ra3 mate.


No. 4216: V. Kichigin. 1. Qf8 + Kh7 2. g6 + Kxg6 3. Qf5 + Kxf5 (Qxf5; Sh4 +) 4. Sd4+ Ke4 5. Sxb5 c2 6. Kb2 Kd3 7. Sd4 Kxd4 8. a7 wins.


No. 4217: Cs. Meleghegyi. I: 1. Sf7 Bf8 2. Sd8 Kd4 3. Ke8 Bc5 4. Sb7 Bb4 5. Kd7 Kd5 (Kc3;Sd6) 6. Sxa5 wins.
II: 1. Sg6 Kd4 2. Se7 Kd3/i 3. Sc6 Bf8 4. Sxa5 Kc3 5. e7 Bxe7 6. Kxe7 Kb4 7. Kd6 Kxa5 8. Kc5 wins.
i) 2. ..., Kc3 3. b4 Kxb4 4. Sc8.

JRH: For II, see Berger, No. 98 in T1000.


No. 4218: A. Melnikov. 1. $\mathrm{Sg} 5 \mathrm{Qf} 4 / \mathrm{i}$ 2. Qe5 + f6 (Qxe5;Sf7 +) 3. Qxf4 a1Q 4. Sf7 + Bxf7 5. Qb8 + Bg8 6. Qb1 Qa7 7. Qg6 Qe7 (Qf7;Qxg8 + ) 8. Qf7 g1Q 9. Qxg8 + -Xg8 stalemate. i) $1 . \ldots$, f6 2. Sf7 +Bxf 73 . Qg 3 Qxg 3 stalemate, or 1. ..., f5 2. Qc3 + e5 3. Qg3 draw.


No. 4219: L. Mozes. 1. e5 fe 2. Sf3 d6 3. h4 c2 4. Sg5 hg 5. h5 c1Q 6. h6.

No. 4220: E. Maidanik, late of the USSR, now Israel (temporarily resident in UK). 1. Rg5/i with two variations:

1. ..., a5 + 2. Ka3/ii Bd4 3. Rd5 Se6 4. $\operatorname{Sd} 8+$ /iii $\operatorname{Sxd} 85 . \operatorname{Rxd} 7+$
2. ..., Bd4 2. Rd5 Se6/iv 3. Rxd7 +/v

Kc6 4. Rd5 Kxd5/vi 5. Bg2 mate. i) 1. Rd5? Be6 2. $\mathrm{Sd} 8+\mathrm{Kc} 7$, or 2. Rg5 Bd4.
ii) 2. Kxa5? Bb6 consolidates (or even 2. ..., Be3 3. Rxg7? Bc1 mate). 2. Kc3? Bd4+. 2. Kb3? Bd4 3. Rd5 Be6. 2. Kc4? Sf5 3. Rxg1 Be6 + .
iii) 4. Rxd7+? Kc6 and wR is dominated!
iv) 2. ..., Be8(e6) 3. Sd8+. 2. ..., a5 +3 . Ka3.
v) 3. $\mathrm{Sd} 8+$ ? $\mathrm{Sxd} 84 . \mathrm{Rxd} 7+\mathrm{Kc} 85$. Rxd4 Sc6 + , or 5. Bh3 e6.
vi) 4 . ..., a5 + or 4 . ..., Bc5 + 5. Kc4 and all is protected.


No. 4221: E. Maidanik. 1. Re7/i Bd8/ii 2. f6 Sxc6/iii 3. Kh3/iv and now 3. ..., Bxe7 4. fg, or 3. ..., Sxe7 4. f7.
i) If Bl takes one of the pawns the draw is clear.
ii) 1. ..., Sb5 2. Kh3 Bh2 (Kg1; Rxg7)
3. $\mathrm{Re} 1+\mathrm{Bg} 1$ 4. fg. 1. ..., g5 +2 . JRH finds Gurgenidze and Katsne:Kh3 g4 + 3. Kxg4 Sb5 4. Kh3. 1. ..., Bb6(b8) 2. Rxa7.
iii) 2. ..., Sb 5 is met by either 3 . fg or 3. Kg 3 .
iv) 3. Kg 3 ? Bxe7 4. fg Bd6+, or 3 . ..., Sxe7 and 4. ..., f5 +


No. 4222: Em. Dobrescu and P. Joitsa. Judges: G.M. Kasparyan and G. Akopyan. There were 146 entries, all but 16 from the USSR. 1. Se8 + (f7? Kb7;) 1. ..., Kb7 2. Sd6 + Ka7 3. Sc8 + Sxc8 4. b6 + (f7? Sb7;) 4. Sxb6 5. f7 Se7 6. f8Q Sc6+ 7. Kb5 $\mathrm{Sd} 4+$ 8. Kb4 Be7 + 9. Ka5 Sc6 + (Bxf8 stalemate) 10. Kb5 Sd4 + (Bxf8 stalemate) 11. $\mathrm{Ka} 5 \mathrm{Sb} 3+12$. Kb 5 Sd4 + (Bxf8 stalemate) 13. Ka5 Sc4 + 14. $\mathrm{Ka} 4 \mathrm{Sb} 2+$ (Bxf8 stalemate) 15. Ka5 Sc6 + (Bxf8 stalemate) 16. Kb5 $\mathrm{Sd} 4+$ 17. Ka5 Sb3 + 18. Kb5 Sd4 + (Bxf8 stalemate) 19. Ka5 Bd8 +20. $\mathrm{Kb} 4 \mathrm{Be} 7+21$. Ka5 Sc4 + 22. Ka 4 $\mathrm{Sb6}+$ 23. Ka5 Bg5 24. Kb4 Be7 + 25. Ka5.
'The idea of perpetual stalemate is expressed in a very interesting manner: in analogous studies it is usual to find bSS playing the main role, but here we have bB also."
son (1977), EG47. 2961 and Katsnelson (1974/5), EG43. 2499.


No. 4223: V. Nikitin. 1. f7 Bg5 + 2. Kd7 Bc6 + 3. Ke6 Bd5 + 4. Kd6 Bxd2 5. Kc5 Bcl 6. Kb4 Bd2+ 7. Kxb5 Bc6 + 8. Kc4 Bd5 + 9. Kc5 Bc1 10. Kb4 Bd2 + 11. Кxa4 Bc6 + 12. $\mathrm{Ka} 3 \mathrm{Bc} 1+$ 13. $\mathrm{Kb} 4 \mathrm{Bd} 2+14$. Kc4 Bd5 + 15. Kb5 Bc6 + 16. Kxc6 Bb4 17. a4 h4 18. Kb5 Be7 19. a5. "Victory is attained as a result of sustained and artful manoeuvres of wK."


No. 4224: V. Nestorescu. 1. Re2+ Se6 + 2. Kf5 Kf7 3. a7 Rc5 + 4. Re5 $\mathrm{Sg} 7+5 . \mathrm{Kf} 4 \mathrm{Rc} 4+6 . \mathrm{Re} 4 \mathrm{Se} 6+7$. $\mathrm{Kf} 3 \mathrm{Rxc} 3+$ 8. Re3 $\mathrm{Sg} 5+$ 9. Kf2
 12. Rel. 'An interesting study with systematic movement of pieces."


No. 4225: V.A. Bron. 1. g7 b1Q + 2 . Kxb1 Rxb5 + 3. Kc2/i Rc4 + 4. Kd2 Rg4 5. Rf8 + Rb8 6. Rf7 Rxg3 7. Kd3. A position of reciprocal zugzwang. 7. ..., Rg4 8. Kc3/ii gRb4 9. Rf8 Rg4 10. Rf7 Rg3 11. Kd3 Rg4 12. Kc3 Rg3 13. Kd3.
i) 3. $\mathrm{Kc} 1 ? \mathrm{Rg} 4$ 4. $\mathrm{Rf} 8+\mathrm{Rb} 85 . \mathrm{Rf} 7$ Rxg3
ii) 8. Kc2? gRb4 9. Rf8 Rc4+ 10. Kd3 Rg4 11. Rf7 Rg3, with a position of reciprocal zugzwang. "A subtle study of manoeuvres motivated by reciprocal zugzwang." (The award did not include analysis substantiating the claims of reciprocal zugzwang. AJR)


No. 4226: T.B. Sarkissian. 1. Rc7 d3 2. e4 Sa4 3. Sd5 d2 4. Rxc2 d1Q 5. Rg2 Kxg2/i 6. Se3 + Kf3 7. Sxd1 Kxe4 8. Sc3 + Sxc3 9. b6.
i) 5. ..., $\mathrm{Qc} 1+6 . \mathrm{Sf} 4+\mathrm{Qxf4}+7$. Kxf4 Kxg2 8. Kf5.
"'Sharp play allows wbP to promote to wQ."


No. 4227: Y. Bazlov. 1. g7 Be6 2. Sf3 Sxf3 3. Sf4 + Kh6 4. Sxe6 $\mathrm{Sg} 1+5$. Kf1 Kh7 6. Sf4/i Rh4 7. Sg2 Rh1 8. Sf4 Kg8 9. Kf2/ii Kf7 10. Kf1 Rh4 11. Sg 2 Rh 1 12. Sf 4 Kg 8 13. Kf2 Kxg7/iii 14. Kg2 Rh4 15. Kg3 Rh6 16. Kg 2 Rh 4 17. Kg 3 Rh 8 18. Kg 2 Rh4 19. Kg3 drawn.
i) Reciprocal zugzwang. 6. Kg2? Rh6 7. $\mathrm{Sg} 5+\mathrm{Kxg} 7$.
ii) Reciprocal zugzwang. 9. Kg2? Rh4 10. Kg3 Rh7.
iii) A study by A. Gurvich has arisen. It won 4th Prize in Ceskoslovensky Sach in 1947.
wKf2 wSb1 wSc2 wPf3; bKb2 bRb3 bSh2 $4+3=$.

1. Sd2 Rd3 2. Sf1 Rxf3 + 3. Kg2 Rxf1 4. Se3 Rel 5. Kf2 Rc1(a1) 6. Kg 2 .


No. 4228: D. Gurgenidze. 1. Kg 7 Re 6 2. Kf7 Bh3 3. Rd3 Bf5 4. Rd5 Bg4 5. Rd4 Bh3 6. Rd3 Rh6 7. Kg7 Rh7 + 8. Kg6 Kc5 9. Rc3 + Kd4 10. Rb3 Rh8 11. Kg7 Rh5 12. Kg6 Rh8 13. $\mathrm{Kg} 7 \mathrm{Rg} 8+14 . \mathrm{Kf7} \mathrm{Rh} 8$ 15. Kg 7 .

No. 4229: N. Kondratyuk. 1. Rb4+ Kcl 2. Rxg2 Bf3 +3 . Kxf3 Rf1 +4 . Kg4 Rg1 5. Rc4+ Kd1 6. Rxd4+ Kel 7. Re4 +Kf 1 8. Rxf4 +Kxg 2 9. Kh5 h1Q 10. Rh4.

No. 4230 Y. Belyakin and A.G. Kopnin 3rd Hon. Men., Jubilee Tourney of Soviet Armenia, 1980


No. 4230: Y. Belyakin and A.G. Kopnin. 1. Re8 Rg1 2. Ra8 +Kb 23. g7 Rxg7 4. Bxb4 Sg6+5. Ke3 Bxb4 6. Rb8 Kc3 7. $\mathrm{Rc} 8+\mathrm{Kb} 2$ 8. Rb8 $\mathrm{Re} 7+$ 9. Kd4 Ka3 10. Ra8 +Kb 2 11. $\mathrm{Rb} 8 \mathrm{Rd} 7+12 . \mathrm{Ke} 3 \mathrm{Kc} 313$. Rc8 + .


No. 4231: J. Vandiest. 1. Se8 +Kb 7 2. $\mathrm{Sd} 6+\mathrm{Ka} 8$ 3. Qa1 + (Qh1? Qa6;)
3. ..., Qa7 4. Qh8 + Qb8 5. Qh1 Qb2 6. Qe4 Qg7 7. Kc6 Qa7 8. Kb5 + Kb8 9. Qe8 + Kc7 10. Qe7 + .


No. 4232: A. Koranyi. This and the next study are really twins - but each deserves its own diagram. 1. Kf6 Sd4 2. Ba8/i Bh3 3. Ke5 f3 4. Kxd4 f2 5. Be4.
i) 2. Bh1? Bh3 3. Ke5 f3 4. Kxd4 Bg2.


No. 4233: A. Koranyi. 1. Ke6 Sc4 2. $\mathrm{Bg} 1 / \mathrm{i} \mathrm{Bg} 3$ 3. Kd5 e3 4. Kxc4 Bf2 (e2;Bd4) 5. Bh2 e2 6. Be5.
i) 2. Ba7? Ka6. 2. Bf2? Bb4 3. Kd5 e3.

## + HAROLD LOMMER

It was Harold who told me the shocking fact that there was no magazine for studies enthusiasts, and who, when I expressed astonishment, said, "Why don't you do it?" The challenge was accepted, and EG remains as a kind of memorial to him. There is continuity. It was Harold who turned me into a temporary journalist in Yugoslavia in 1958, so that I joined the privileged parties touring with the Grandmasters and other VIP's (Tal, Fischer, Olafsson among them), when I would otherwise have been left out. It was Harold who gave me a 'sine die' membership of his Soho club, the Mandrake where, when I knew it, a call-girl operation worked incongruously alongside the chess. It was Harold who carefully and constructively criticised my early studies. It was Harold who on many occasions interpreted in several tongues at sessions of the FIDE Composition Commission's meetings. Indeed, it was because of the exhausting labour of these multi-lingual translations that he declined in later years to attend these annual get-togethers, since he felt he would be expected to translate all the time. But he retained the non-voting position of ''Expert'" to the Commission on the subject of endgame studies, a post now held by the non-linguist FIDE Grandmaster Gia Nadereishvili. It was Harold who wrote articles for EG, regaled us with reminiscences, wrote long and detailed letters about FIDE matters, about chiphers, about nearly anything. He always seemed the same age, ever young. He leaves a widow, but no children. I cannot believe that he has gone.

## David Hooper writes:

Harold Maurice Lommer, b. Islington, 18 November 1904, d. Valencia, 17 December 1980; International

Judge of Chess Compositions (1956), International Arbiter (1962), International Master of Chess Compositions (1974). Of German parentage he considered himself to be English; and he was, undoubtedly, the leading British study composer. He moved to Geneva when he was four years old and his enthusiasm for studies was kindled at the age of twelve when he was shown the Saavedra study; but he began composing only in his late twenties after settling in England. At first he specialized in promotion tasks, and among his several achievements in this field was his prizewinning allumwandlung study in 1933 ('1234' No. 1197). He was the first to achieve this task which Rinck said would not be realized if a composer were offered a million francs. His prize, however, was twenty francs. In later years Lommer also composed problems, fairy and orthodox, becoming one of a handful who achieved the Babson task. His approach was always artistic and he considered the mere achieving of a task to be worthless if it were not well done. An example of his search for perfection was his economical rendering of star flights ('1357' No. 1344), the result of several attempts. From the end of the Second World War until 1961, when he retired to Valencia, he was joint proprietor of the Mandrake club in Soho, where chess boards and men were always available and where he revealed the art of studies to many players (myself included): we could not have had a better teacher. Of quiet, generous, and unassuming character he made friends all over the world, tolerating patiently both the efforts of beginners and the egotism of such experts as Rinck and Chéron. Lommer will also be remembered for his two great collections: '1234' Modern End-game Studies (1939, revised edition 1967) (in collaboration with
M.A. Sutherland), and '1357 Endgame Studies' (1975). Both became classics, and together they contain 2.615 studies composed up to 1973. Casting a wider net than was possible for the editors of the FIDE Albums ( 1.504 studies from 1914 to 1973) he also gave more detailed solutions.

DVH

+ ANDRÉ CHÉRON, 25.ix.9512.ix.80. We hope to do justice to the life-time achievements of the Chéron phenomenon in a later issue. Just a few weeks after his departure, Madame Chéron, his widow, also died.
Anthony Dickins writes: It was in 1942 that I first went to the newlyopened '"Mandrake"' - tea and coffee only, two and three pence respectively, in the one room, before they started burrowing underground. After the War they opened the bar - and then some time later they pick-axed their way through to the wine-vault that was used for chess. Many famous names were to be found there O. Bernstein, Mieses, Keres, Wade, the cartoonist 'Vicky', Willie Winter, B.J. d'Andrade, Friedrich Sämisch, for a few, along with the poets, writers and artists, Dylan Thomas, Colquhoun and Macbride, David Gascoyne, Tambimuttu, Costi (the escaped Russian artist), and countless others. A wonderful international intellectual concourse of free spirits living la vie de Boheme under the magic wand of Harold (Prospero!) Lommer, while his wife Valyne served us the curries and the omelettes. And so the magic spell lasted until 1956 when Prospero retired to Spain and the whole enchanted fabric fell to airy nothing, and nothing like it has been seen since - or ever will be seen again, to the world's loss. And now Prospero himself has gone too - and only Valyne remains, among many, many treasured memories.

Addresses of magazines and bulletins that run annual (or biennial) international informal tourneys for original endgame studies. The studies editor's name, if any, is in brackets. (In an address, a comma generally indicates the end
of a line.) BULETIN PROBLEMISTIC (Ing. C. Petrescu) Aleea Budacu Nr. 5; bloc M.3, Sc.3, et.III ap. 54, Bucarest 49 sector 3, Romania
GAZETA CZESTOCHOWSKA (S. Limbach) Srytka Pocztowa 349, 42207 Czestochowa, Poland
L'ITALIA SCACCHISTICA (Prof. R. Ravarini) Via F. Nazari 8, 28100 Novara, Italy
LITALIA SCACCHISTICA (Prof. R. Ravarini) Via F. Nazari 8, 28100 Novara, Italy
PROBLEM (Dr S. Zlatic) Baboniceva ul. 35, Zagreb, Yugoslavia
THE PROBLEMIST (A.J. Sobey) 15 Kingswood Firs, Grayshott, Hindhead, Surrey GU26 6EU, England
REVISTA ROMANA DE SAH (I. Grosu) Str. Batistei 11, Bucuresti, Romania
ROKADA (Joze Zunec) Cecovje 58/C, 62390 Ravne na Koroskem, Yugoslavia
SACHOVE UMENIE (supplement to Ceskoslovensky Sach) (Prof. L. Kopac) Zizkova Nam 20, 46001 Liberec, Czechoslovakia
SCACCO! (Dr. E. Paoli) Editrice Scacchistica Internazionale, Via S. Brigida 39, 80133 Napoli, Italy
SCHACH (M. Zucker) Ernst Enge Strasse 96, 90 Karl Marx Stadt, DDR
SCHACH-ECHO (K. Junker) Ruderbruch 18, 5982 Neuenrade, BRD
SCHAKEND NEDERLAND (F.A. Spinhoven) van Kinsbergenstraat 25, Haarlem, Netherlands
SCHWEIZERISCHE SCHACHZEITUNG (Beat Neuenschwander) Nobsstrasse 3, 3072 Ostermundigen, Switzerland
SHAFMAT (for Israel 'Ring' Tourney) H. Aloni, 6 Meirovich Str., Netanya 42-310, Israël
SHAKHMATY V SSSR Abonementny Yaschik 10, Moscow G-19, 121019 USSR
SINFONIE SCACCHISTICHE (Dr. E. Paoli) Viale Piave 25, Reggio Emilia 42100, Italy
SUOMEN SHAKKI (K. Virtanen) Kivilevontie 14E, 33420 Tampere 42, Finland
SUOMEN SHAKKI (K. Virtanen) Kivilevontie 14E, 33420 Tampere 42, Finland
SZACHY (Jan Rusinek) Ul. Wspolna 61, 00-687 Warsaw, Poland
THEMES-64 (B. Fargette) 51 bis - Avenue de Lorraine, 78110 Le Vésinet, France
TIDSKRIFT FÖR SCHACK (A. Hildebrand) Herrgarden, 74041 Morgongava, Sweden
64 - Shakhmatnoe Obozrenie, Ul. Arkhipova 8, Moscow K-62, 101913 GSP, U.S.S.R
Kegular, but not international, tourneys are: Bulletin of Central Chess Club of USSR, Chervony Girnik. These are
informal. Other tourneys are irregular, or 'one-off'.
${ }^{*} C^{*}$ denotes, in EG, either an article relating to electronic computers or, when above a diagram, a position generated by computer.
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